arXiv:1211.5954v1 [math.NA] 26 Nov 2012

Oversampling for the Multiscale Finite Element Method

Patrick Henning [*]   Daniel Peterseim [†] [‡]

November 27, 2012

Abstract

This paper reviews standard oversampling strategies as performed in the Multiscale Finite Element Method (MsFEM). Common to those approaches is that the oversampling is performed in the full space restricted to a patch but including coarse finite element functions. We suggest, by contrast, to perform local computations with the additional constraint that trial and test functions are linear independent from coarse finite element functions. This approach re-interprets the Variational Multiscale Method in the context of computational homogenization. This connection gives rise to a general fully discrete error analysis for the proposed multiscale method with constrained oversampling without any resonance effects. In particular, we are able to give the first rigorous proof of convergence for a MsFEM with oversampling.

Keywords a priori error estimate, finite element method, multiscale method, MsFEM, oversampling

AMS subject classifications 35J15, 65N12, 65N30

1 Introduction

The numerical treatment of partial differential equations with rapidly varying and strongly heterogeneous coefficient functions is still a challenging area of present research, especially with regard to applications such as porous media flow or the transport of solutes in groundwater. In such problems, the occurring permeabilities and hydraulic conductivities have rapidly changing features due to different types of soil, microscopic inclusions in the bottom or porous subsurface rock formations. These fine scale structures are highly heterogeneous and typically they need to be accounted in the whole computational domain in order to obtain reliable approximations of important physical effects. Therefore, there is need for computational grids that resolve the fine scale variations. But when pore scale effects become relevant or when domains spread over kilometers, the computational load becomes extremely large and in several applications even too large to treat the problem with standard finite element or finite volume methods. This is just one instance of a so called multiscale problem as it arises in hydrology, physics or industrial engineering.

---

[*] Institut für Numerische und Angewandte Mathematik, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Einsteinstr. 62, D-48149 Münster, Germany

[†] Institut für Mathematik, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, D-10099 Berlin, Germany

[‡] The second author is supported by the DFG Research Center Matheon Berlin through project C33.

To avoid (or at least decrease) the computational issues that come along with multiscale equations, there are a lot of methods that are specifically constructed to deal with this kind of problems. Typically, these methods decouple the global fine scale problem into localized subproblems which can be treated independently from each other and with comparably low costs. The list of meanwhile proposed multiscale methods is long. Amongst the most popular methods are the heterogeneous multiscale finite element method (HMM), initially introduced by E and Engquist [EE03a] (see also [EE03b, EE05, Abd09] or the Variational Multiscale Method by Hughes et al. [Hug95, HFMQ98] (see also [LM07, Mål11, MP11])

In this paper, we deal with another popular method: the Multiscale Finite Element Method (MsFEM) proposed by Hou and Wu [HW97] and further investigated in several contributions [HWC99, EHW00, EP03, HWZ04]. There is an ongoing development of the method to apply it to various fields and equations. For instance, a MsFEM for nonlinear elliptic problems is proposed in [EHG04], a formulation for two phase flow problems in porous media is presented in [EH07], advection diffusion problems are treated in [DYX09] and an application to elliptic interface problems with high contrast coefficients is presented in [CGH10]. A survey on the method is given in the book by Efendiev and Hou [EH09]. There is vast literature of works devoted to the method but there are still open questions of strong interest. The most relevant issue is a rigorous error analysis of the method, in particular in the case of non-periodic microstructures.

The essential idea of the MsFEM is to start the computations with a common finite element space with a coarse underlying grid. Then, the basis functions are modified to account for fine scale variations that cannot be captured by a coarse grid. More specifically, local fine scale computations are performed to determine so called *corrector functions*. These corrector functions can be added as local perturbations to the original set of basis functions of the coarse finite element space.

However, it is well known that the classical MsFEM suffers from so called resonance errors, which are typically of order $O(\frac{\varepsilon}{H})$, where ε denotes a characteristic size of the small scale and where H denotes the mesh size of the coarse grid (c.f. [HWC99, HWZ04]). This implies that the numerical error becomes large in regions where the coarse grid size is close to the characteristic length scale of the microscopic oscillations. There are two different explanations for this error. The first one is a mismatch between the boundary conditions imposed for the local fine scale problems and global behavior of the oscillatory exact solution (c.f [EHW00]). The second explanation is due to size and geometry of the sampling patch (c.f. [HWZ04]). The averaged behavior in such a patch should be 'representative' so that we can speak about a perfect sample size. If this is not the case, the final approximation might be distorted. In the periodic setting, for instance, the sampling domain should be some multiple of the periodic cell. On triangular patches with cathetuses of the length of a period, this patch is only half a periodic cell (i.e. the patch has bad size and geometry) and lacks essential information. This yields a completely wrong approximation (c.f. [Hen12]).

In a lot of applications, such as oil reservoir simulations or the transport of solutes in groundwater, a characteristic micrscopic length scale ε is unknown, cannot be identified or does not exist at all. In scenarios without a clear scale separation it is often impossible to predict whether or not we are in the regime of resonance errors and it is very likely to actually hit the problematic regime. Hence, the quality of the final approximation can not be determined unless resonance errors are eliminated. For this purpose, different *oversampling strategies* have been proposed. The fundamental idea of each of these techniques is to extend the local problems to larger patches, perform the computation on these *oversampling domains* but feed the coarse scale equation only with the information obtained within the original smaller patches. This reduces the effect of wrong boundary conditions and bad sampling sizes. In this paper, we present the two major strategies for oversampling and discuss their advantages and disadvantages. On the basis of these considerations we propose a new strategy that overcomes the issues of the previous strategies and of which we can prove rigorous error estimates for the corresponding multiscale approximations.

This contribution is structured as follows: In Section 2 we recall the classical formulation of the MsFEM without oversampling. The most popular approaches for oversampling are discussed in Section 3 and in Section 4 we propose a new strategy for which we present a rigorous error analysis.

2 The Multiscale Finite Element Method

In this section, we state the setting of this paper and we establish the required notations. We recall the classical Multiscale Finite Element Method (MsFEM) as initially proposed by Hou and Wu [HW97].

2.1 Setting an notation

Consider a bounded Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with piecewise flat boundary and some matrix-valued coefficient $A \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}_{sym})$ with uniform spectral bounds $\gamma_{\min} > 0$ and $\gamma_{\max} \geq \gamma_{\min}$,

$$\sigma(A(x)) \subset [\gamma_{\min}, \gamma_{\max}] \quad \text{for almost all } x \in \Omega. \tag{1}$$

Given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, we seek the weak solution of

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot A\nabla u &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., we seek $u \in H^1_0(\Omega) := \{v \in H^1(\Omega) \mid v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \text{ in the sense of traces}\}$ that satisfies

$$a\,(u, v) := \int_\Omega A\nabla u \cdot \nabla v = \int_\Omega fv =: F(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1_0(\Omega). \tag{2}$$

We consider two discretization scales $H \geq h > 0$. The coarse scale H is arbitrary whereas the small scale parameter h is constrained by the problem; it is assumed to be smaller than the characteristic length scales of the variations of the diffusion coefficient A.

Let $\mathcal{T}_H$, $\mathcal{T}_h$ denote corresponding subdivisions of Ω into (closed) triangles (for $d = 2$) and tetrahedra (for $d = 3$), i.e., $\bar{\Omega} = \bigcup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_h} t = \bigcup_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} T$. We assume that $\mathcal{T}_H$, $\mathcal{T}_h$ are regular in the sense that any two elements are either disjoint or share exactly one face or share exactly one edge or share exactly one vertex. For simplicity we assume that $\mathcal{T}_h$ is derived from $\mathcal{T}_H$ by some regular, possibly non-uniform, mesh refinement.

For $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_H, \mathcal{T}_h$, let

$$P_1(\mathcal{T}) = \{v \in C^0(\Omega) \mid \forall T \in \mathcal{T}, v|_T \text{ is a polynomial of total degree} \leq 1\}$$

denote the set of continuous and piecewise affine functions.

Accordingly, $V_h := P_1(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ denotes the 'high resolution' finite element space and the 'coarse space' is given by $V_H := P_1(\mathcal{T}_H) \cap H^1_0(\Omega) \subset V_h$. For any given subset $\omega \subset \Omega$ we define the restriction of V_h to ω with a zero boundary condition by $\mathring{V}_h(\omega) := V_h \cap H^1_0(\omega)$. The nonconforming fine space $V_{h,\mathcal{T}_H}$ is defined by

$$V_{h,\mathcal{T}_H} := \{v_h \mid \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_H,\ (v_h)|_T \in V_h \cap H^1(T)\}.$$

A general function in $v \in V_{h,\mathcal{T}_H}$ may jump across edges of the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ and, hence, does not belong to $H^1_0(\Omega)$. However, the $\mathcal{T}_H$-piecewise gradient $\nabla_H v$, with $(\nabla_H v)|_T = \nabla(v|_T)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$, exists. Typically, MsFEM approximations obtained with oversampling are nonconforming approximations of the exact solution in the sense that they do not belong to $H^1_0(\Omega)$.

In the following $x_T \in T$ denotes an arbitrary point, for instance the barycenter of T. For $\Phi_H \in V_H$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$, the affine extension operator $E_T : V_H \to P_1(\Omega)$ is given by:

$$E_T(\Phi_H)(x) := (x - x_T) \cdot \nabla \Phi_H(x_T) + \Phi_H(x_T).$$

Finally, by χ_T we denote the characteristic (or indicator) function with $\chi_T(x) = 1$ for $x \in T$ and $\chi_T(x) = 0$ elsewhere.

For the sake of simplicity, all fine scale compuatations are performed in subspaces of the finescale finite element space V_h. The Galerkin solution $u_h \in V_h$ which satisfies

$$a_h(u_h, v) = F(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in V_h \tag{3}$$

may, hence, be considered as a reference approximation. Note that we never solve this large-scale equation. The function u_h serves as a reference solution to compare our multiscale approximations with. The underlying assumption is that the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ is chosen sufficiently fine so that u_h is sufficiently accurate.

Throughout this paper, standard notation on Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces is employed and $a \lesssim b$ abbreviates an inequality $a \leq C\,b$ with some generic constant $0 \leq C < \infty$ that may depend on the shape regularity of finite element meshes and the contrast $\gamma_{\max}/\gamma_{\min}$ but *not* on the mesh sizes H, h, and the regularity or the variations of the diffusion matrix A; $a \approx b$ abbreviates $a \lesssim b \lesssim a$.

2.2 The classical MsFEM and reformulation

We first present the classical MsFEM without oversampling as originally stated by Hou and Wu [HW97], and similarly by Brezzi et al. [BFHR97]. They proposed the strategy to enrich the set of standard finite element basis functions by fine scale information. The information is determined by solving local problems on the fine scale. We recall briefly the method and reformulate it in terms of a correction operator Q_h and a corresponding corrector basis.

Let N denote the dimension of the coarse space V_H and let $\{\Phi_i \mid \ 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ denote the usual nodal basis of V_H. Given some basis function Φ_i, the corresponding MsFEM basis function $\Phi_i^{\text{MsFEM}} \in V_h$ is uniquely determined by the conditions that for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and for all $\phi_h \in \mathring{V}_h(T)$ there holds

$$\int_T A(x) \nabla \Phi_i^{\text{MsFEM}}(x) \cdot \nabla \phi_h(x)\, dx = 0 \quad \text{and } \Phi_i^{\text{MsFEM}} = \Phi_i \text{ on } \partial T. \tag{4}$$

The span of these MsFEM functions is called the MsFEM solution space

$$V_H^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} := \mathrm{span}\{\Phi_i^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} \mid \ 1 \le i \le N\}.$$

In particular, $V_H^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} \subset V_h \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$, because $\{\Phi_i^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} \mid \ 1 \le i \le N\}$ defines a conforming set of basis functions. The classical MsFEM in Petrov-Galerkin formulation reads as follows:

Definition 2.1 (MsFEM without oversampling)**.** The MsFEM approximation $u_H^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} \in V_H^{\mathrm{MsFEM}}$ is defined as the solution of

$$\int_\Omega A\nabla u_H^{\mathrm{MsFEM}}(x) \cdot \nabla\Phi_H(x)\,dx = \int_\Omega f(x)\Phi_H(x)\,dx \qquad \text{for all } \ \Phi_H \in V_H. \tag{5}$$

With regard to the general framework for oversampling that we introduce in the subsequent sections, we note that the MsFEM can be rewritten in the following way:

Remark 2.2. If $u_H^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} \in V_H^{\mathrm{MsFEM}}$ denotes the MsFEM approximation stated in Definition 2.1, then we have $u_H^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} = u_H + Q_h(u_H)$, where $u_H \in V_H$ solves

$$\int_\Omega A\left(\nabla u_H + \nabla Q_h(u_H)\right) \cdot \nabla\Phi_H = \int_\Omega f\Phi_H \quad \text{for all } \Phi_H \in V_H, \tag{6.a}$$

with

$$Q_h(\Phi_H)(x) := \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \partial_{x_i}\Phi_H(x_T) w_{T,i}(x), \tag{6.b}$$

and $w_{T,i} \in \mathring{V}_h(T)$ being the unique solution of

$$\int_T A\nabla w_{T,i} \cdot \nabla\phi_h = -\int_T Ae_i \cdot \nabla\phi_h \quad \text{for all } \phi_h \in \mathring{V}_h(T). \tag{6.c}$$

The set of all functions $w_{T,i}$ is what we are going to call a *local corrector basis*. Note that from the computational point of view, it is cheaper to compute the corrector basis instead of directly computing the set of multiscale basis functions given by (4). The latter one involves more problems to solve. For instance if $d = 2$, the assembling of the corrector basis $\{w_{T,i} \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_H, i = 1, 2\}$ requires the solution of $2 \cdot |\mathcal{T}_H|$ local problems, whereas the solutions of $3 \cdot |\mathcal{T}_H|$ local problems are required to assemble $\{\Phi_i^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} \mid \ 1 \le i \le N\}$ by only using the coarse basis functions (for which we have 3 per coarse element).

The equivalence between the formulations (5) and (6) can be easily verified by the relation $\Phi_i^{\mathrm{MsFEM}} = \Phi_i + Q_h(\Phi_i)$. Observe that for every i, for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and every $\phi_h \in \mathring{V}_h(T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_T A(x)\left(\nabla\Phi_i(x) + \nabla Q_h(\Phi_i)(x)\right) \cdot \nabla\phi(x)\,dx \\ = \ &\sum_{i=1}^{d} \partial_{x_i}\Phi_H(x_T) \int_T A(x)\left(e_i + \nabla w_T^i(x)\right) \cdot \nabla\phi(x)\,dx = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and $\Phi_i + Q_h(\Phi_i) = \Phi_i$ on ∂T, which is the definition of Φ_i^{MsFEM}.

A symmetric version of (6.a) is given by: find $u_H \in V_H$ with

$$\int_\Omega A\left(\nabla u_H + \nabla Q_h(u_H)\right) \cdot \left(\nabla\Phi_H + \nabla Q_h(\Phi_H)\right) = \int_\Omega f\Phi_H \tag{7}$$

for all $\Phi_H \in V_H$. Note that (6.a) and (7) are identical, because

$$\int_T A\left(\nabla u_H + \nabla Q_h(u_H)\right) \cdot \nabla\phi_h = 0 \quad \text{for all } \ \phi_h \in \mathring{V}_h(T).$$

3 Oversampling strategies

As already discussed in the introduction, the classical MsFEM in Definition 2.1 can be strongly affected by resonance errors which might lead to completely wrong approximations of the exact solution (c.f. [EH09]). In the absence of scale separation or any knowledge about a suitable sample size for the local problems, the classical MsFEM needs a modification. *Oversampling* is considered to be a remedy to this issue. Oversampling means that the local problems (6.a) are solved on larger domains, but only the interior information (i.e. we restrict the gained fine scale information to T) is communicated to the coarse scale equation (6.a). This reduces the effect of a wrong boundary condition imposed for the local problems. However, there is no unique way of extending the local problems (6.a) to larger patches. Different extensions lead to different oversampling strategies. We now present the two common approaches for oversampling. We rephrase both approaches so that they fit into a common framework. We discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the methods and then we propose our new oversampling strategy. Note that each of the subsequent strategies is a generalization of the case without oversampling.

Let us introduce some additional notations. First we introduce the notion of an admissible patch.

Definition 3.1 (Admissible patch)**.** For $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$, we call $U(T)$ an *admissible patch* of T, if it is non-empty, open, and connected, if $T \subset U(T) \subset \Omega$ and if it is the union of elements of $\mathcal{T}_h$, i.e.

$$U(T) = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h^*} \tau, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{T}_h^* \subset \mathcal{T}_h.$$

A given set of admissible patches is given by $\mathcal{U}$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{U} := \{U(T) \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_H \text{ and } U(T) \text{ is an admissible patch}\},$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ contains one and only one patch $U(T)$ for each $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$. The set $U(T) \setminus T$ is called an *oversampling layer*. The thickness of the oversampling layer is denoted by $d_{\mathcal{U},T} := \operatorname{dist}(T, \partial U(T))$. Furthermore, we define

$$d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min} := \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}_H} d_{\mathcal{U},T} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\max} := \max_{T \in \mathcal{T}_H} d_{\mathcal{U},T}$$

the minimum and maximum thickness.

In the spirit of (6.a) and (7), we now define the coarse scale equation for an arbitrary Multiscale Finite Element Method with a chosen oversampling strategy. As we will see later on, all MsFEM realizations only differ in the correction operator Q_h that determines the oversampling strategy.

Definition 3.2 (Framework for Oversampling Strategies)**.** Let $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ denote the index of the oversampling strategy that we specify in the following sections. Let furthermore

$$\{w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\alpha} \mid 1 \leq i \leq d,\, T \in \mathcal{T}_H\}$$

denote a given local corrector basis that depends on the chosen strategy α (see (6.a)-(6.c) for the trivial case of such a basis). Now, $Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha} : V_H \rightarrow V_{h,\mathcal{T}_H}$ with

$$Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(\Phi_H)(x) := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_H} \chi_T(x) \sum_{i=1}^{d} \partial_{x_i} \Phi_H(x_T)\, w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(x) \quad \text{for } \Phi_H \in V_H \tag{8}$$

defines the (not necessarily conforming) correction operator. We define the MsFEM approximation $u_H^\alpha + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^\alpha)$, obtained with strategy α in Petrov-Galerkin formulation by: find $u_H^\alpha \in V_H$ such that

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_H} \int_T A \left(\nabla u_H^\alpha + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^\alpha) \right) \cdot \nabla \Phi_H = \int_\Omega f \Phi_H \quad \text{for all } \Phi_H \in V_H. \tag{9}$$

The MsFEM approximation $u_H^{S,\alpha} + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^{S,\alpha})$, obtained with strategy α and a symmetric formulation is given by: find $u_H^{\alpha,\text{sym}} \in V_H$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_H} \int_T A \left(\nabla u_H^{\alpha,\text{sym}} + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^{\alpha,\text{sym}}) \right) \cdot \left(\nabla \Phi_H + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(\Phi_H) \right) \qquad (10) \\ = \int_\Omega f(\Phi_H + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(\Phi_H)) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\Phi_H \in V_H$. Observe that strategies can *only* differ in the choice of the corrector basis. The remaining structure of the methods is always the same.

In the next section we demonstrate how existing oversampling strategies fit into the framework presented in Definition 3.2.

3.1 Classical strategy initially introduced by Hou and Wu

We start with describing the classical oversampling strategy as proposed by Hou and Wu [HW97] and further used and investigated in several works (c.f. [EHG04, CS08, EH09]).

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$ be fixed and let $\{\Phi_1^T, \Phi_2^T, ..., \Phi_{d+1}^T\} \subset V_H$ denote the basis functions that belong to the d nodal points in T. Hou and Wu [HW97] proposed the following oversampling strategy: solve for $\tilde{\Phi}_j^T \in V_h(U(T))$ with

$$\int_{U(T)} A \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_j^T \cdot \nabla \phi_h = 0 \quad \text{for all } \phi_h \in \mathring{V}_h(U(T)) \tag{11}$$

and the boundary condition $\tilde{\Phi}_j^T = E_T(\Phi_j^T)$ on $\partial U(T)$ (where $E_T(\Phi_j^T)$ denotes the affine extension of $(\Phi_j^T)|_T$). Then, for a given coarse function $\Phi_H \in V_H$, Φ_H^{MsFEM} is defined by

$$\Phi_H^{\text{MsFEM}} = \sum_{j=1}^{d+1} c_j \tilde{\Phi}_j^T.$$

where the c_j are such that $\Phi_H^{\text{MsFEM}}(x_j) = \Phi_H(x_j)$ for all $d+1$ coarse nodes x_j of T. The final coarse scale equation reads: find $u_H^{\text{MsFEM}} \in V_{h,\mathcal{T}_H}$ with

$$\int_\Omega A \nabla_H u_H^{\text{MsFEM}} \cdot \nabla \Phi_H = \int_\Omega f \Phi_H \tag{12}$$

for all $\Phi_H \in V_H$. Note that u_H^{MsFEM} is a nonconforming approximation of u.

Note that in [HWZ04, EHW00], a slightly different condition is used to define the coefficients c_i. However, it turns out that this modified condition leads to nothing but Oversampling Strategy 2 below.

We shall rephrase this multiscale method with oversampling strategy in the framework of Definition 3.2. For this purpose, let $\{\phi_1^T, \phi_2^T, ..., \phi_d^T\} \subset V_h$ denote the *fine scale* basis functions that belong to the (coarse) nodes in $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and let $Q_T(\Phi_H) := \Phi_H^{\text{MsFEM}} - E_T(\Phi_H)$ define local corrector to communicate the gained information to the coarse scale equation. The corresponding reduced fine scale space $\mathring{V}_h^r(U(T))$ is given by

$$\mathring{V}_h^r(U(T)) := \mathring{V}_h(U(T)) \setminus \operatorname{span}\{\phi_1^T, \phi_2^T, ..., \phi_{d+1}^T\}. \tag{13}$$

First, we observe

$$Q_T(\Phi_H)(x_i) = \Phi_H^{\text{MsFEM}}(x_i) - \Phi_H(x_i) = 0 \quad \text{for all nodes } x_i \text{ in } T,$$

which gives us $Q_T(\Phi_H) \in \mathring{V}_h^r(U(T))$. Next, by the definition of Φ_H^{MsFEM}, we get that $Q_T(\Phi_H) \in \mathring{V}_h^r(U(T))$ is the unique solution of

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{U(T)} A\left(\nabla \Phi_H(x_T) + \nabla Q_T(\Phi_H)\right) \cdot \nabla \phi_h \\
&\quad = \int_{U(T)} A\left(\nabla E_T(\Phi_H) + \nabla Q_T(\Phi_H)\right) \cdot \nabla \phi_h \\
&\quad = \sum_{i=1}^{d} c_i \int_{U(T)} A \nabla \tilde{\Phi}_i^T \cdot \nabla \phi_h = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\phi_h \in \mathring{V}_h^r(U(T))$ (where the trial space might be also replaced by $\mathring{V}_h(U(T))$). Again, since $\nabla \Phi_H(x_T)$ is a constant in $U(T)$ we can rewrite $Q_T(\Phi_H)$ in terms of a corrector basis. This gives us the first definition of oversampling within our framework. We summarize the strategy as follows:

Oversampling Strategy 1. Let $\mathring{V}_h^r(U(T))$ denote the reduced fine scale space given by (13) and let $w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{1}} \in \mathring{V}_h^r(U(T))$ (for $i \in \{1, 2, .., d\}$) denote the solution of

$$\int_{U(T)} A \nabla w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{1}} \cdot \nabla \phi_h = -\int_{U(T)} A e_i \cdot \nabla \phi_h \quad \text{for all } \phi_h \in \mathring{V}_h^r(U(T)). \tag{14}$$

For $\Phi_H \in V_H$ we define the corrector $Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{1}}(\Phi_H) \in V_{h,\mathcal{T}_H}$ by

$$Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{1}}(\Phi_H) := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_H} \chi_T(x) \sum_{i=1}^{d} \partial_{x_i} \Phi_H(x_T)\, w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{1}}(x).$$

Now, $u_H^{\mathbf{1}} + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{1}}(u_H^{\mathbf{1}})$, where $u_H^{\mathbf{1}} \in V_H$ is the solution of (9), defines the MsFEM approximation obtained with Oversampling Strategy **1**, i.e.

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_H} \int_T A\left(\nabla u_H^{\mathbf{1}} + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^{\mathbf{1}})\right) \cdot \nabla \Phi_H = \int_\Omega f \Phi_H \quad \text{for all } \Phi_H \in V_H.$$

In particular, we have $u_H^{\text{MsFEM}} = u_H^{\mathbf{1}} + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{1}}(u_H^{\mathbf{1}})$ with u_H^{MsFEM} denoting the solution of (12). We therefore define

$$u_H^{\mathbf{1},\text{MsFEM}} := u_H^{\mathbf{1}} + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{1}}(u_H^{\mathbf{1}}).$$

Observe the equivalence of this formulation with the non-oversampling case for $U(T) = T$ as stated in Remark 2.2.

Remark 3.3. The explicit boundary condition for the local problems (11) is often missing in literature (c.f. [HW97, EH09]). However, it seems that these computations were performed for the case described above, i.e. the solution $\tilde{\Phi}_i^T$ of (11) takes the values of an affine function on $\partial U(T)$ (c.f. [EHW00, HWZ04] which also refer to the numerical experiments in [HW97]). In some works (c.f. [EHG04]) the local problems (11) are formulated with the boundary condition $\tilde{\Phi}_i^T = \Phi_i^T$ on $\partial U(T)$. This seems to be a mistake because if $U(T)$ is larger than the support of the original basis functions, the new basis functions will be equal to zero.

3.2 Oversampling motivated from homogenization theory

The second type of oversampling is motivated from numerical homogenization theory. Assume that we regard

$$\text{find } u^\varepsilon \in H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ with } \quad \int_\Omega A^\varepsilon \nabla u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \Phi = \int_\Omega f \Phi \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

and assume that A^ε is uniformly bounded and coercive in ε, that A^ε is H-convergent to some matrix A^0 and that $u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u^0$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, where $u^0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is called the homogenized solution.

Then, a numerical approximation of the homogenized solution u^0 can be obtained by discretizing a more convenient equation (see (15) below). For this purpose, let $B(x,\eta)$ denote an open ball centered at $x \in \Omega$ with radius $\eta > 0$ and let $N(x,\eta)$ denote an open neighborhood of $x \in \Omega$ with a Lipschitz boundary. It is assumed that there exist $0 < c \leq C$ so that for all $\eta > 0$ and all $x \in \Omega$ there holds $c|B(x,\eta)| \leq |N(x,\eta)| \leq C|B(x,\eta)|$. We seek $u^{\varepsilon,\eta,\zeta} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ solving

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega f(x)\Phi(x)\,dx \\ &\quad = \int_\Omega |N(x,\eta)|^{-1} \int_{N(x,\eta)} A^\varepsilon(y) \left(\nabla u^{\varepsilon,\eta,\zeta}(x) + \nabla_y Q(u^{\varepsilon,\eta,\zeta})(x,y) \right) \cdot \nabla \Phi(x)\,dy\,dx \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

for $\Phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, where for given $\Psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ the corrector $Q(\Psi)(x,\cdot) \in H_0^1(N(x,\eta+\zeta))$ is the solution of

$$\int_{N(x,\eta+\zeta)} A^\varepsilon(y) \left(\nabla \Psi(x) + \nabla_y Q(\Psi)(x,y) \right) \cdot \nabla \phi(y)\,dy = 0$$

for all $\psi \in H_0^1(N(x,\eta+\zeta))$. Then, if $\zeta = \zeta(\eta)$ and $\lim_{\eta\to 0} \frac{\zeta(\eta)}{\eta} = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\eta,\zeta\to 0} \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|u^0 - u^{\varepsilon,\eta,\zeta}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} = 0.$$

In particular, we get

$$\lim_{\eta,\zeta\to 0} \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|u^\varepsilon - u^{\varepsilon,\eta,\zeta}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0.$$

This result was shown by Gloria [Glo06, Glo08] in a general nonlinear setting. Since $u^{\varepsilon,\eta,\zeta}$ yields a good approximation of u^ε, the result suggests to look at discretizations of (15). This was for instance exploited in [HO11]. A general numerical framework that can be seen as a discretization of (15) was proposed in [HO12]. Particularly, the HMM and the MsFEM are recovered from the framework, which leads to a straightforward oversampling strategy. This strategy can be formulated as follows (c.f. [Glo08, HO12, HOS12]):

Oversampling Strategy 2. For $i \in \{1,2,..,d\}$, let $w^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{2}}_{h,T,i} \in \mathring{V}^r_h(U(T))$ solve

$$\int_{U(T)} A\nabla w^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{2}}_{h,T,i} \cdot \nabla\phi_h = -\int_{U(T)} Ae_i \cdot \nabla\phi_h \quad \text{for all } \phi_h \in \mathring{V}_h(U(T)). \tag{16}$$

and for $\Phi_H \in V_H$, let $Q^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{2}}_h(\Phi_H) \in V_{h,\mathcal{T}_H}$ denote the corrector given by (8). Now, if $u^{\mathbf{2}}_H \in V_H$ is the solution of (9) , then $u^{\mathbf{2}}_H + Q^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{2}}_h(u^{\mathbf{2}}_H)$ defines the MsFEM approximation obtained with Oversampling Strategy 2. We therefore denote

$$u^{\mathbf{2},\mathrm{MsFEM}}_H := u^{\mathbf{2}}_H + Q^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{2}}_h(u^{\mathbf{2}}_H).$$

We immediately see, that Oversampling Strategy 1 and 2 only differ in the fine scale trial space for the local problems and that they are identical for $U(T) = T$, even though Strategy 2 was formulated independently of Strategy 1. In [HWZ04, EHW00], Strategy 2 is written in terms of an asymptotic expansion in the periodic case. Also note that this second approach is closely related to the Heterogeneous Multiscale Finite Element Method, where the same type of oversampling is used (c.f. [EE03a, EE03b, EE05, HO09]). Notably, HMM and MsFEM can be reinterpreted in a common homogenization framework (c.f. [Glo06, Glo08]) and in a common numerical framework (c.f. [HO12]).

3.3 Discussion of the strategies

As we just discussed, there are two widely used strategies for oversampling for the MsFEM. However, the difference between both approaches is only minor and the behavior of the resulting approximations appears to be qualitatively the same. The small difference in the local trial spaces does not seem to have a significant impact. At least, the estimates available for strategy 1 are the same as for strategy 2 and vice versa. Furthermore, the available literature does not seem to distinguish between these strategies. For instance, [CS08] (using Oversampling Strategy 1) claims to generalize the results of [EHW00] (using Oversampling Strategy 2). Such a mixture of strategies can be observed in several works on this topic. To the best of our knowledge, even though both approaches seem to behave identical, a rigorous proof of this conjecture is still missing. Strategy 1 suggests to fix the corrector $Q^{\mathbf{1}}_T(\Phi)$ in the corners of the coarse grid element T (forcing it to zero), whereas the corrector proposed by Strategy 2 does not have such a restriction leaving it completely free in these corners.

Remark 3.4. As already mentioned, the MsFEM might be also considered in a symmetric formulation (c.f. [EHW00]), i.e. the coarse scale equation reads: find $u_H \in V_H$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \int_T A \left(\nabla u^\alpha_H + \nabla Q^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}_h(u^\alpha_H)\right) \cdot \left(\nabla\Phi_H + \nabla Q^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}_h(\Phi_H)\right) \\ = \int_\Omega f(\Phi_H + Q^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}_h(\Phi_H))\end{aligned}$$

for all $\Phi_H \in V_H$ and where $Q^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}_h$ is defined either with Oversampling Strategy 1 or 2. However, the theoretical and numerical results in [HWZ04] show that this version of the method still suffers from resonance errors. One explanation was suggested by Gloria [Glo08] who proposed a simple computation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_T A\left(\nabla u_H^\alpha + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^\alpha)\right)\cdot\left(\nabla \Phi_H + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(\Phi_H)\right)\\
&= \int_T A\left(\nabla u_H^\alpha + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^\alpha)\right)\cdot \nabla\Phi_H\\
&\qquad + \int_T A\left(\nabla u_H^\alpha + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^\alpha)\right)\cdot \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(\Phi_H)\\
&= \int_T A\left(\nabla u_H^\alpha + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^\alpha)\right)\cdot \nabla\Phi_H\\
&\qquad + \int_{U(T)\setminus T} A\left(\nabla u_H^\alpha + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H^\alpha)\right)\cdot \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(\Phi_H).
\end{aligned}
$$

This means that the effective MsFEM bilinear forms in Petrov-Galerkin and non-Petrov-Galerkin formulation differ in the term

$$
\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H}\int_{U(T)\setminus T} A\left(\nabla u_H^\alpha + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H)\right)\cdot \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(\Phi_H),
$$

which still seems to contain the problematic boundary layers that we tried to get rid of. Observe that we integrate over the layer $U(T)\setminus T$. This is exactly the region we encounter unpleasant boundary effects of the correctors $Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(u_H)$ and $Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\alpha}(\Phi_H)$. This might imply that the Petrov-Galerkin formulation should be preferred.

Let us review the two essential results concerning the convergence of MsFEM approximations with oversampling. The first result is due to Gloria and the most general result currently available for Strategy 1 and 2:

Theorem 3.5. *Let $A^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}_{sym})$ be a sequence of matrices with uniform spectral bounds $\gamma_{\min} > 0$ and $\gamma_{\max} \geq \gamma_{\min}$,*

$$
\sigma(A^\varepsilon(x)) \subset [\gamma_{\min},\gamma_{\max}] \quad \textit{for almost all } x\in\Omega \ \textit{ and for all } \varepsilon > 0 \tag{17}
$$

and assume that A^ε is G-convergent. Let furthermore $u_H^\varepsilon \in V_H$ denote the corresponding MsFEM approximation either obtained with Oversampling Strategy 1 or with Strategy 2 and let

$$
\frac{\operatorname{diam}(U(T)) - \operatorname{diam}(T)}{\operatorname{diam}(T)} \to 0 \ \textit{ for } H\to 0.
$$

Then we have:

$$
\lim_{H\to 0}\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\|u^\varepsilon - u_H^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0.
$$

The proof is given in [Glo08], Theorem 6 and Remark 7. At first glance the result appears counter-intuitive in the sense that it suggests to let the oversampling converge to zero. However, the first limit is in ε, which makes the relative thickness $\frac{\varepsilon}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}}$ of the oversampling layer grow to infinity. Hence, the correct interpretation is that for fixed ε the computational domains should blow up to infinity. In this case, the optimal corrector problem is an equation formulated on whole $\mathbb{R}^d$. These corrector problems are exactly the cell problems known from periodic and stochastic homogenization theory. In the periodic setting the classical cell problem can be extended to the $\mathbb{R}^d$ by periodicity and in the stochastic setting they are directly formulated in $\mathbb{R}^d$ to obtain the correct stochastic average (c.f. [JKO94]).

Theorem 3.5 gives a clear message in the case of extremely small microscopic variations. If ε (the characteristic length scale of the fine scale oscillations) is (globally) sufficiently small then the resulting MsFEM approximation yields very good approximations. This is a very important result, but it does not answer the question how (thick) to choose an oversampling patch. Especially, we cannot predict how the method behaves if there is a large spectrum of oscillations without a scale separation. For instance, we might encounter variations, where it is hard to tell which of them are macroscopic and which are microscopic (i.e. 'ε-dependent'). In practice, we do not construct an artificial sequence in ε, we only have a given scenario and a given set of data.

The next theorem due to Hou, Wu and Zhang is much more restrictive, but it gives a more quantitive answer than Theorem 3.5:

Theorem 3.6. *Assume that $d = 2$, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and that A is a bounded, elliptic, symmetric and ε-periodic C^3-matrix, i.e. $A(x) = A_p(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$, with $A_p \in C^3([0,1]^d, \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}_{sym})$ being periodic. Let $u^\varepsilon_H \in V_{h,\mathcal{T}_H}$ denote the MsFEM approximation obtained with Oversampling Strategy 2. Then:*

$$\|u^\varepsilon_H - u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}} + H + \varepsilon(\log H)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right),$$

$$\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon_H - \nabla u^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}} + H + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

A proof of this theorem is given in [HWZ04]. The assumption $d = 2$ seems to be essential for their strategy. Note that in [HWZ04] the theorem is formulated without the $\frac{1}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}}$ contribution. Instead, the authors make the assumption that the oversampling layer is sufficiently large. Following their proofs one can easily see that the generalized estimate reads as above (c.f. [EH09] for the case $d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min} = CH$). In particular, the $\frac{\varepsilon}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}}$-term describes the decay of the error between the exact corrector and the corrector with wrong boundary condition in a coarse element T. The decay turns out to be inverse proportional to the thickness of the layer. Because of the ε scaling of the solution, the effective term becomes $\frac{\varepsilon}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}}$. This seems to be a sharp estimate for the decay due to the findings in [EHW00] and [CH03]. A proof of Theorem 3.6 for Oversampling Strategy 1 can be achieved in the same fashion as in [HWZ04]. Theorem 3.6 predicts the following: if locally $\mathrm{O}(H)=\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon)$ the patch size of the local problems must not be of order $\mathrm{O}(H)$ to preserve convergence. Still, the theorem only gives an answer of how to choose the oversampling patches $\mathcal{U}$ if ε is a known parameter.

If the thickness of the oversampling layer is of order $\mathrm{O}(h)$ both estimates in Theorem 3.6 receive an order $\mathrm{O}(\frac{\varepsilon}{h})$ term and the right hand sides remain large. In general, the thickness $d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}$ must be large in comparison to ε. Analytically, this implies that $\mathrm{O}(H)$-oversampling might be not enough in regions where we deal with resonance errors due to $\mathrm{O}(H)=\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon)$. This seems to show up in the numerical experiments in [HWZ04], where the authors observe a stagnation in the convergence of the H^1-error for H entering the region with $\mathrm{O}(H)=\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon)$. The effect on the L^2-error is less strong. However, the value of $d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}$ is missing in the experiments in [HWZ04] so we can only assume that $d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}$ is of order H. Otherwise the computation of the MsFEM basis functions becomes quite expensive.

Remark 3.7. In [EHW00], the symmetric version (10) of the MsFEM is considered. Here, the derived L^2-estimate reads:

$$\|u_H^\varepsilon - u^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\varepsilon + H^2 + \varepsilon(\log H) + \frac{\varepsilon}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}} + C_r \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{H}\right)^2 \right),$$

where u_H^ε denotes the MsFEM approximation of the symmetric problem (10) determined with Oversampling Strategy 1. Due to the numerical experiments in [EHW00], C_r seems to have a considerable size, so that this term is dominating the estimate if locally $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon) = \mathrm{O}(H)$. We notice that the estimate is worse then the L^2-estimate for the Petrov-Galerkin version of the method, because the last term cannot be reduced even for large $d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}$. These observations are consistent with Remark 3.4. However, this leads to an additional problem of the MsFEM with Strategy 1 or Strategy 2. On the one hand, the Petrov-Galerkin version should be preferred over the symmetric version (see the estimates). On the other hand, the existence and uniqueness of the corresponding MsFEM approximations has not been established so far, not to mention stability. For the symmetric version, we can simply exploit the ellipticity of A to conclude that the method is well posed and stable. For the Petrov-Galerkin version there is no such argument. The only result is a perturbation result due to Gloria [Glo08], saying that if the oversampling size is small enough (i.e. if the difference between Petrov-Galerkin formulation and symmetric formulation is small enough) then we still have existence and uniqueness. So far, we do not know of any generalization. The missing well-posedness of the Petrov-Galerkin MsFEM's for Strategy 1 and 2 is a remarkable issue of these approaches.

The ε-terms in the estimates that cannot be reduced with $H \succeq \varepsilon$ should be seen as fixed modeling errors. They describe the error between exact solution and homogenized solution. In a general non-periodic non-stochastic scenario they cannot be quantified.

In conclusion we have two findings. First, in general, both approaches do not show clear asymptotics for a convergence to the exact solution (for $H \succeq \varepsilon$). There is always a remainder of order ε, even if $U(T) = \Omega$. In particular, this is a problem if ε unknown or if the micro structure is heterogeneous. Second, if the modeling error of order ε is negligible, Theorem 3.6 still suggests that linear convergence (with respect to H) can only be achieved if the oversampling thickness scales with $\mathrm{O}(1)$ which makes the local problems prohibitively expensive. Since the estimate for the decay rate $\frac{\varepsilon}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}}$ of the corrector error is sharp (in the periodic setting) we cannot hope for much improvement of the final error estimates stated in Theorem 3.6.

We may summarize the following issues that we address to solve with our new oversampling strategy that we propose in the next section:

a) elimination of resonance errors of any kind,

b) clear prediction for the size of oversampling patches without explicit knowledge about the micro-structure or scale separation,

c) construction of a conforming approximation in $H_0^1(\Omega)$,

d) a rigorous error analysis in H without restrictive regularity assumptions on the coefficients and for all space dimensions,

e) a-priori error estimation in the fully discrete setting (previous results were obtained under the assumption that the local problems are solved exactly),

f) formulation of a stable approach for which we can guarantee existence and uniqueness of the resulting MsFEM approximation,

g) prevention of unstable splittings due to point evaluations as, e.g., required to implement the constraint in oversampling strategy 1 (cf. Definition of $\overset{\circ}{V}{}_h^r(U(T))$ in (13)).

4 Constrained oversampling

In this section we introduce a third oversampling strategy for which we derive a rigorous a-priori error estimate. The results are presented in Subsection 4.1 and a corresponding proof is given in Subsection 4.2.

4.1 New strategy and rigorous convergence

In the following, let $\mathcal{N}$ denote the set of Lagrange points of the coarse grid $\mathcal{T}_H$. For a given node $z \in \mathcal{N}$, $\Phi_z \in V_H$ denotes the corresponding nodal basis function.

Our new approach is based on some multiscale decomposition of the space V_h,

$$V_h = V_H \oplus W_h, \tag{18}$$

where the space W_h contains the 'fine scale' functions of V_h, i.e., functions that are not captured by V_H. More precisely, we choose W_h to be the kernel of some Clément-type quasi-interpolation operator $I_H : H_0^1(\Omega) \to V_H$,

$$W_h := \{v \in V_h \mid \ I_H(v) = 0\}. \tag{19}$$

The operator $I_H : H_0^1(\Omega) \to V_H$ is defined as follows [Car99]. Given $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $I_H v := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{N}} (I_H v)(z) \Phi_z$ is determined by the nodal values

$$(I_H v)(z) := \frac{\int_\Omega v \Phi_z}{\int_\Omega \Phi_z} \tag{20}$$

for $z \in \mathcal{N}$. The nodal values are weighted averages of the function over nodal patches $\omega_z := \operatorname{supp} \Phi_z$. The operator is linear, surjective, bounded, and invertible on the finite element space V_H. Hence, the decomposition (18) exists and is stable; it is even orthogonal in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Given some element $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and an admissible patch $U(T)$, we define $I_H^{U(T)}$ to be the Clément-type quasi-interpolation operator with respect to the domain $U(T)$ (with extension by zero in $\Omega \setminus U(T)$), i.e., $I_H^{U(T)} v(z)$ is given by (20) for interior vertices $z \in \mathcal{N} \cap U(T)$ and $(I_H^{U(T)})v(z) = 0$ for all vertices $z \in \mathcal{N} \setminus U(T)$. This superscript $U(T)$ in the notation $I_H^{U(T)}$ shall indicate that $I_H^{U(T)} v$ satisfies homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial U(T)$, i.e., the definition (20) applies only vertices interior to the patch. Hence, $I_H^{U(T)} v = 0$ does not imply $I_H v = 0$, in general. This subtle detail ensures that our new method boils down to the classical MsFEM in the case without oversampling. However, it generates some technicalities in the proofs later on.

Recall the (local) approximation and stability properties of the interpolation operators $I_H^{U(T)}$ [Car99]: There exists a generic constant C such that for all $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_H$ with $K \subset \bar{U}_k(T)$ it holds

$$H_T^{-1}\|v - I_H^{U(T)}v\|_{L^2(K)} + \|\nabla(v - I_H^{U(T)}v)\|_{L^2(K)} \leq C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\omega_K)}, \tag{21}$$

where $\omega_K := \cup\{K' \in \mathcal{T}_H \mid K' \cap K \neq \emptyset\}$. The constant C depends on the shape regularity of the finite element mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ but not on the local mesh size $H_T := \mathrm{diam}(T)$.

Remark 4.1 (Nodal interpolation)**.** Since we consider a fully discrete setting, where corrector problems are solved in the fine scale finite element space V_h, we could have chosen nodal interpolation instead of Clément-type interpolation. The subsequent definitions and results will be almost verbatim the same. However, nodal interpolation does not allow the estimate (21) with an h-independent constant if $d > 1$. The best constant $C = C_d(h)$ reads $C_2(h) = \log(H/h)$ and $C_3(h) = (H/h)^{-1}$ depending on the spatial dimension d (c.f. [Yse86]). Since this constant enters basically all error estimates below, we would end up with an h-dependence of the multiplicative constants in the final error estimates. In 2d this can be acceptable because the dependence on h is only logarithmic.

With the decomposition (18) we do not search the local correctors in the full fine scale space V_h, but only in the constrained space W_h. The advantage is the following: as stated in the previous section for oversampling strategy 1 and 2, the standard decay for the difference between the local correctors and the global 'exact' corrector is of order $\frac{1}{d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min}}$ (see Theorem 3.6), but in the constrained space W_h we can achieve an exponential decay (cf. Lemma 4.9 below).

We now propose our new Oversampling Strategy:

Oversampling Strategy 3 (Constrained oversampling)**.** Let W_h denote the space given by (19) and define

$$\mathring{W}_h(U(T)) := \{v \in W_h \mid I_H^{U(T)} v_h = 0 \text{ and } v_h|_{\Omega \setminus U(T)} = 0\}.$$

The local correctors $w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}} \in \mathring{W}_h(U(T))$ (for $i \in \{1, 2, .., d\}$) are defined as the (unique) solutions of

$$\int_{U(T)} A\nabla w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}} \cdot \nabla\phi_h = -\int_T Ae_i \cdot \nabla\phi_h \quad \text{for all } \phi_h \in \mathring{W}_h(U(T)). \tag{22}$$

For general $\Phi_H \in V_H$ we define the correction operator $Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}} : V_H \to V_h$ by

$$Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}(\Phi_H)(x) := \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \partial_{x_i}\Phi_H(x_T) w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}(x).$$

Now, the global coarse scale approximation $u_H^{\mathbf{3}} \in V_H$ is the solution of (10), i.e. it solves

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{3}}(u_H^{\mathbf{3}}, \Phi_H) &:= \int_\Omega A\left(\nabla u_H^{\mathbf{3}} + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}(u_H^{\mathbf{3}})\right) \cdot \left(\nabla\Phi_H + \nabla Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}(\Phi_H)\right) \\ &= \int_\Omega f(\Phi_H + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}(\Phi_H)) \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

for all $\Phi_H \in V_H$. The corresponding MsFEM approximation is given by

$$u_H^{\mathbf{3},\mathrm{MsFEM}} := u_H^{\mathbf{3}} + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}(u_H^{\mathbf{3}}).$$

Remark 4.2. As for Strategy 1 and 2, in the special case $U(T) = T$ (no oversampling) Oversampling Strategy 3 coincides with the classical MsFEM stated in Definition 2.1 (and rewritten in (6.a-c)). In general, the crucial differences between the classical Strategies 1, 2 and Oversampling Strategy 3 are the following:

a) The variational problem for the local corrector in Oversampling Strategy 3 is posed in the constrained space $\mathring{W}_h(U(T))$ whereas the classical corrector problem seeks the local corrector in the full space $\mathring{V}_h(U(T))$ restricted to the patch.

b) The support of the integrals on the right hand side in (14) and (16) is $U(T)$. In our new version we use only the element T. This allows us to exploit nice summation properties of the local projectors, without using indicator functions χ_T that lead to discontinuities.

c) In the classical setting, the local correctors are restricted to the corresponding elements to derive the global corrector. For Oversampling Strategy 3, we simply sum up (weighted by the coefficients of the finite element function) the local contributions to get the global corrector. Note that our global corrector is conforming in the sense that its image is a subset of $V_h \subset H^1_0(\Omega)$ whereas the classical setup leads to a non-conforming corrector.

d) In Strategy 3, we do not use a Petrov-Galerkin formulation for the global problem (23). Since A is assumed symmetric, a symmetric discretization appears more natural. Furthermore, we immediately inherit coercivity for the global bilinear form $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{3}}$. This gives us existence and uniqueness of $u_H^{\mathbf{3}}$ and the arising MsFEM approximation is well posed and the method stable. The typical disadvantage of the symmetric version which still suffers from resonance errors (which is why Petrov-Galerkin is typically preferred) does not remain for our strategy.

Remark 4.3 (Perturbation of the right hand side)**.** We might also replace the right hand side of (23) by the term $\int_\Omega f\Phi_H$. This introduces only a perturbation of order $\|Hf\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ in the H^1-error.

Remark 4.4 (Non-Symmetric formulation)**.** As for the classical strategies, one might also consider the non-symmetric Petrov-Galerkin formulations: find $u_H^{\mathbf{3}} \in V_H$ such that

$$\int_\Omega A\left(\nabla(u_H^{\mathbf{3}} + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}(u_H^{\mathbf{3}}))\right) \cdot \nabla\Phi_H = \int_\Omega f\Phi_H \quad \text{for all } \Phi_H \in V_H.$$

or

$$\int_\Omega A\left(\nabla u_H^{\mathbf{3}}\right) \cdot \nabla(\Phi_H + Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}(\Phi_H)) = \int_\Omega f\Phi_H \quad \text{for all } \Phi_H \in V_H.$$

We note that Theorem 3.5 still holds for MsFEM approximations obtained with Oversampling Strategy 3. The reason is that Theorem 3.5 in particular covers the case without oversampling (see also [Glo06]). In fact, the proof given in [Glo08] goes back to the arguments used for the case without oversampling. But for $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{T}_H$ (no oversampling), all strategies 1,2 and 3 are identical. Therefore, the proof is similar for each approach. Especially concerning Strategy 3: if the thickness of the oversampling layer decreases faster than the coarse mesh size, we are almost in the case of Oversampling Strategy 1, up to a small perturbation of the source term that is of order $\max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \frac{|U(T)\setminus T|}{|T|}$ and that converges to zero under the assumptions of Theorem 3.5.

In this sense, Strategy 3 also covers the homogenization setting established by Gloria, with $u_H^{\mathbf{3}}$ converging to the homogenized solution as in Theorem 3.5.

Besides obvious advantages of our new strategy mentioned previously, e.g., its conformity, stability, unique solvability, we now formulate the main convergence result which is proved in Subsection 4.2.

Theorem 4.5 (Rigorous a-priori error estimates). *Let $\mathcal{T}_H$ be given coarse triangulation and let $\mathcal{U}$ denote a corresponding set of admissible patches, with the property $d_{\mathcal{U}}^{\min} \succeq H \log(H^{-1})$. By $\mathcal{T}_h$ we denote a sufficiently accurate fine triangulation of Ω, where u_h denotes the associated finite element solution given by (3). If $u_H^{\mathbf{3},\text{MsFEM}}$ is the MsFEM approximation determined with Oversampling Strategy 3 and if $u_H^{\mathbf{3}}$ denotes the corresponding coarse part, then the following a-priori error estimates hold true:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_h - \nabla u_H^{\mathbf{3},\text{MsFEM}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq CH, \\ \|u_h - u_H^{\mathbf{3},\text{MsFEM}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq CH^2, \\ \|u_h - u_H^{\mathbf{3}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq CH. \end{aligned}$$

Here, C denotes a generic constant that depends on f, $\gamma_{\min}$ and $\gamma_{\max}$ but not *on the regularity of the exact solution or the variations of A. Details on the constants are given in Theorems 4.12 and 4.14.*

4.2 Proof of the main result

Before we prove the error estimates for the MsFEM with the correctors presented in Oversampling Strategy 3, we introduce some simplifying notations for this subsection.

Definition 4.6 (Notations for Oversampling Strategy 3). Let $w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}} \in \mathring{W}_h(U(T))$ denote the local corrector basis given by (22), let $Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}$ denote the corresponding corrector operator from Strategy 3 and let $u_H^{\mathbf{3}}$ denote the arising (coarse) MsFEM approximation. In the following, we skip the redundant indices and use the following notation:

$$w_T^i := w_{h,T,i}^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}, \quad Q_h := Q_h^{\mathcal{U},\mathbf{3}}, \quad u_H := u_H^{\mathbf{3}} \quad \text{and} \quad u^{\text{MsFEM}} := u_H + Q_h(u_H).$$

The first lemma treats the (unpractical) case of maximal oversampling.

Lemma 4.7 (Error estimate for maximal oversampling). *Let $U(T) = \Omega$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$. Then the multiscale approximation u_H that solves* (23) *satisfies the error estimate*

$$\|\nabla u_h - \nabla(u_H + Q_h(u_H))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \gamma_{\min}^{-1} \|Hf\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where u_h solves the reference problem (3)*.*

If, moreover, $(f, w_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0$ for all fine scale functions $w_h \in W_h$, then $u_H + Q_h(u_H) = u_h$.

Proof. For $U(T) = \Omega$, Q_h maps onto the fine scale space W_h. Given $\Phi_H \in V_H$, it is easily checked that $Q_h(\Phi_H) = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H}\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i}\Phi_H(x_T)w_T^i$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
a(Q_h(\Phi_H),\phi_h) &= \int_\Omega A\nabla\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H}\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i}\Phi_H(x_T)w_T^i(x)\right)\cdot\nabla\phi_h \\
&= \int_\Omega A\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H}\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i}\Phi_H(x_T)\nabla w_T^i(x)\right)\cdot\nabla\phi_h \\
&= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H}\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i}\Phi_H(x_T)\int_\Omega A\nabla w_T^i(x)\cdot\nabla\phi_h \\
&= -\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H}\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i}\Phi_H(x_T)\int_T Ae_i\cdot\nabla\phi_h \\
&= -\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H}\int_T A\nabla\Phi_H\cdot\nabla\phi_h \\
&= -a(\Phi_H,\phi_h)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\phi_h \in W_h$. This means that Q_h is the orthogonal projection Φ_H onto the fine scale space W_h with respect to the scalar product $a(\cdot,\cdot)$. Hence we get the orthogonal direct sum

$$V_h = \tilde{V}_H \oplus_{\perp_a} W_h, \text{ where } \tilde{V}_H := \{\Phi_H + Q_h(\Phi_H) \mid \Phi_H \in V_H\}. \tag{24}$$

Moreover, it holds Galerkin orthogonality, i.e., for $e_h := u_h - (u_H + Q_h(u_H))$ and for arbitrary $\Phi_H + Q_h(\Phi_H) \in \tilde{V}_H$,

$$\begin{aligned}
a(e_h,\Phi_H + Q_h(\Phi_H)) &= a(u_h,\Phi_H + Q_h(\Phi_H)) - a(u_H + Q_h(u_H),\Phi_H + Q_h(\Phi_H)) \\
&\overset{(23)}{=} 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The combination of (24) and (25) shows that $e_h \in W_h$ and therefore $I_H(e_h) = 0$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{\min}\|\nabla e_h\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} &\le a(e_h,e_h) = a(u_h,e_h) \\
&= \int_\Omega f e_h = \int_\Omega f(e_h - I_H(e_h)).
\end{aligned}$$

The application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on the element level and the estimate (21) for the interpolation error yield the assertion. □

Corollary 4.8. *The new MsFEM is exact (up to the discretization error on the fine scale and oscillations $\|Hf\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ of the right-hand side f) in the limit of maximal oversampling. This results holds true independent of the upper spectral bound $\gamma_{\max}$ and the variations of A. This is the next difference to the previous Strategies 1 and 2.*

Although the error estimate in Lemma 4.7 is encouraging, maximal oversampling is not feasible. We shall study the decay of the correctors away from element they are associated with. For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$, define element patches in the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
&U_0(T) := T, \\
&U_k(T) := \cup\{T' \in \mathcal{T}_H \mid T' \cap U_{k-1}(T) \neq \emptyset\} \quad k = 1,2,\ldots.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Lemma 4.9 (Decay of the ideal correctors)**.** *Let $U(T)=\Omega$ for all $T\in\mathcal{T}_H$ in Oversampling Strategy 3. Then, for all $T\in\mathcal{T}_H$ and all $k\in\mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|A^{1/2}\nabla w_T^i\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus U_k(T))}\lesssim e^{-r\cdot k}\|A^{1/2}\nabla w_T^i\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where r is a positive constant that depends on the square route of the contrast but not on the mesh size or the oscillations of A.

The proof of Lemma 4.9 requires the definition of cut-off functions and an additional lemma. For $T\in\mathcal{T}_H$ and $\ell,k\in\mathbb{N}$ with $k>\ell$, define $\eta_{T,k,\ell}\in V_H$ with nodal values

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{T,k,\ell}(z)&=0\quad\text{for all } z\in\mathcal{N}\cap U_{k-\ell}(T),\\ \eta_{T,k,\ell}(z)&=1\quad\text{for all } z\in\mathcal{N}\cap(\Omega\setminus U_k(T))\,,\text{ and}\\ \eta_{T,k,\ell}(z)&=\frac{m}{\ell}\quad\text{for all } x\in\mathcal{N}\cap\partial U_{k-\ell+m}(T),\ m=0,1,2,\dots,\ell.\end{aligned}\tag{27}$$

Given some $w\in W_h$, the product $\eta_{T,k,\ell}w$ is not in W_h in general. However, the distance of $\eta_{T,k,\ell}w$ and W_h is small in the following sense.

Lemma 4.10. *Given $w\in W_h$ and some cutoff function $\eta_{T,k,\ell}\in V_H$ as in* (27)*, there exists some $\tilde{w}\in\mathring{W}_h(\Omega\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T))\subset W_h$ such that*

$$\|\nabla(\eta_{T,k,\ell}w-\tilde{w})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\lesssim\ell^{-1}\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(U_{k+2}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-2}(T))}.$$

Proof. Fix some $T\in\mathcal{T}_H$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and let $\eta_\ell:=\eta_{T,k,\ell}$. The operator $I_h:H^1_0(\Omega)\cap C(\bar{\Omega})\to V^h$ denotes the nodal interpolant with respect to the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$. Recall its (local) approximation and stability properties

$$\|\nabla(p-I_hp)\|_{L^2(t)}\lesssim h_t\|\nabla^2p\|_{L^2(t)}\quad\text{and}\quad\|\nabla(I_hp)\|_{L^2(t)}\lesssim\|\nabla p\|_{L^2(t)}\tag{28}$$

for all quadratic polynomials p and all $t\in\mathcal{T}_h$. We will use this estimate for the $\mathcal{T}_h$-piecewise quadratic function $p=\eta_\ell w$. Since $\nabla^2\eta_\ell=\nabla^2w=0$ in every $t\in\mathcal{T}_h$, we have that $\nabla_h^2\eta_\ell w=\nabla\eta_\ell\cdot\nabla w$ in t.

According to [MP11, Lemma 1], there exists some $v\in V^h$ such that

$$I_Hv=I_HI_h(\eta_\ell w),\ \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\lesssim\|\nabla I_HI_h(\eta_\ell w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)},\text{ and }\operatorname{supp}(v)\subset\Omega\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T).\tag{29}$$

Hence, $\tilde{w}:=I_h(\eta_\ell w)-v\in\mathring{W}_h(\Omega\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T))$. Since $I_HI_h(cw)=cI_Hw=0$ for any $c\in\mathbb{R}$, we set $c_T^\ell:=|\omega_T|^{-1}\int_{\omega_T}\eta_\ell$ and get

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla I_HI_h(\eta_\ell w)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &=\sum_{\substack{T\in\mathcal{T}_H:\\ T\subset\bar{U}_{k+1}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T)}}\left\|\nabla I_HI_h\left(\left(\eta_\ell-c_T^\ell\right)w\right)\right\|^2_{L^2(T)}\\ &\lesssim\sum_{\substack{T\in\mathcal{T}_H:\\ T\subset\bar{U}_{k+1}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T)}}\left\|\nabla\left(\left(\eta_\ell-c_T^\ell\right)w\right)\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega_T)}\\ &\lesssim\sum_{\substack{T\in\mathcal{T}_H:\\ T\subset\bar{U}_{k+1}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T)}}\|(\nabla\eta_\ell)(w-I_Hw)\|^2_{L^2(\omega_T)}+\left\|\left(\eta_\ell-c_T^\ell\right)\nabla w\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega_T)}\\ &\lesssim\|H\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla w\|^2_{L^2(U_{k+1}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T))}+\sum_{\substack{T\in\mathcal{T}_H:\\ T\subset\bar{U}_{k+1}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T)}}\left\|\left(\eta_\ell-c_T^\ell\right)\nabla w\right\|^2_{L^2(\omega_T)}\\ &\lesssim\|H\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla w\|^2_{L^2(U_{k+2}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-2}(T))}.\end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we used the Poincaré inequality with

$$\|\eta_\ell - c_T^\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(\omega_T)} \lesssim |\omega_T|^{-1}\|\eta_\ell - c_T^\ell\|^2_{L^2(\omega_T)} \lesssim H^2|\omega_T|^{-1}\|\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^2(\omega_T)} \lesssim H^2\|\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(\omega_T)}.$$

In summary we get with the previous computations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla(\eta_\ell w - \tilde{w})\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} &\overset{(29)}{\lesssim} \|\nabla(\eta_\ell w - I_h(\eta_\ell w))\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla I_H I_h(\eta_\ell w)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\overset{(28)}{\lesssim} \|h\nabla\eta_\ell \cdot \nabla w\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|H\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla w\|^2_{L^2(U_{k+2}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-2}(T))} \\
&\overset{(27),(21)}{\lesssim} \left(\|h\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|H\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)\|\nabla w\|^2_{L^2(U_{k+2}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-2}(T))} \\
&\overset{(27)}{\lesssim} \ell^{-2}\|\nabla w\|^2_{L^2(U_{k+2}(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell-2}(T))}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the assertion. ☐

Proof of Lemma 4.9. The proof exploits some recursive Caccioppoli argument as in [MP11]. We fix some $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Given $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell < k-1$, let $\eta_\ell := \eta_{T,k-2,\ell-4} \in V_H$ be some cutoff function as in (27). Lemma 4.10 shows that there exists some $\tilde{w}_T^i \in W_h$ such that $\|\nabla(\eta_\ell w_T^i - \tilde{w}_T^i)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \ell^{-1}\|\nabla w_T^i\|_{L^2(U_k(T)\setminus U_{k-\ell}(T))}$. Observe

$$\int_{\Omega\setminus U_{k-l}(T)} A\nabla w_T^i \cdot \nabla\tilde{w}_T^i = \int_\Omega A\nabla w_T^i \cdot \nabla\tilde{w}_T^i = \int_T Ae_i \cdot \nabla\tilde{w}_T^i = 0 \tag{30}$$

because of $\tilde{w}_T^i \in \mathring{W}_h(\Omega\setminus U_{k-l+1}(T))$. The definition of η_ℓ, the product rule, (22), and (19) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega\setminus U_k(T)} A\nabla w_T^i \cdot \nabla w_T^i &\le \int_{\Omega\setminus U_{k-\ell}(T)} \eta_\ell A\nabla w_T^i \cdot \nabla w_T^i \\
&\le \int_{\Omega\setminus U_{k-\ell}(T)} A\nabla w_T^i \cdot \left(\nabla(\eta_\ell w_T^i) - w_T^i\nabla\eta_\ell\right) \\
&\overset{(30)}{=} \int_{\Omega\setminus U_{k-\ell}(T)} A\nabla w_T^i \cdot \left(\nabla(\eta_\ell w_T^i - \tilde{w}_T^i)) - (w_T^i - \underbrace{I_H(w_T^i)}_{=0})\nabla\eta_\ell\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that, by (27), $\|\nabla\eta_\ell\|_{L^\infty(K)} = |\nabla\eta_\ell(x_K)| \lesssim \ell^{-1}H_K^{-1}$ for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_H$. This and the estimate (21) for the interpolation error show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(w_T^i - I_H(w_T^i))\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^2(K)} &\lesssim \|\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(K)}\|w_T^i - I_H(w_T^i)\|^2_{L^2(K)} \\
&\lesssim H_K^2\|\nabla\eta_\ell\|^2_{L^\infty(K)}\|\nabla w_T^i\|^2_{L^2(\omega_K)} \\
&\lesssim \ell^{-2}\|\nabla w_T^i\|^2_{L^2(\omega_K)}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $K \in \mathcal{T}_H$. The combination of the previous estimates and Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities prove that there is some constant $C_1 > 0$ independent of T, ℓ, k, and the oscillations of A such that

$$\|A^{1/2}\nabla w_T^i\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus U_k(T))} \le C_1\ell^{-1}\|A^{1/2}\nabla w_T^i\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus U_{k-\ell-1}(T))} \tag{31}$$

The choice $\ell := \lceil C_1\, e\rceil$ and the recursive application of (31) readily yield the assertion. ☐

This exponential decay justifies the approximation of the correctors on local patches $U_k(T)$ as proposed in (26). We denote by Q_h^k the corrector that corresponds to the choice $U(T) = U_k(T)$ in Oversampling Strategy 3 and by Q_h^Ω the one for $U(T) = \Omega$.

Corollary 4.11 (Truncation error)**.** *Let $U(T) = \Omega$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$ in Oversampling Strategy 3. Then, for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|A^{1/2}\nabla(w_T^i - w_T^{i,k})\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus U_k(T))} \lesssim e^{-r\cdot k}\|A^{1/2}e_i\|_{L^2(T)},$$

where $r > 0$ is as in Lemma 4.9 (independent of the variations of A or the mesh size).

Proof. Galerkin orthogonality yields

$$\|A^{1/2}\nabla(w_T^i - w_T^{i,k})\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|A^{1/2}\nabla(w_T^i - \tilde{w})\|^2_{L^2(U_{k-1}(T))} + \|A^{1/2}\nabla w_T^i\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\setminus U_{k-1}(T))},$$

where $\tilde{w} \in W_h$ is the finescale function that corresponds to $(1 - \eta_{T,k-1,1})w_T^i$ and which is constructed in the same way as $\tilde{w}$ in the proof of Lemma 4.10. Here, $\eta_{T,k-1,1}$ is some cut-off function as in (27). Since $\operatorname{supp}(\tilde{w}) \subset \operatorname{supp}((1-\eta_{T,k-1,1})w_T^i) \subset U_{k-1}(T)$ we have that $\tilde{w} \in \mathring{W}_h(U_k(T))$ and the use of Galerkin orthogonality is justified. Proceeding as in Lemma 4.10 shows that

$$\|A^{1/2}\nabla(w_T^i - w_T^{i,k})\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|A^{1/2}\nabla w_T^i\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\setminus U_{k-2}(T))}$$

and the application of Lemma 4.9 yields the assertion. □

Theorem 4.12 (H^1 error estimate)**.** *Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $U(T) = U_k(T)$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{T}_H$ in Oversampling Strategy 3. Then the multiscale approximation u_H^k that solves* (23) *satisfies the error estimate*

$$\|\nabla u_h - \nabla(u_H^k + Q_h^k(u_H^k))\| \lesssim \gamma_{\min}^{-1}\|Hf\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + e^{-rk}\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)},$$

where u_h is the reference solution from (3) *and $r > 0$ as in Lemma 4.9.*

Remark 4.13 (Relation to the results [MP11])**.** In the case of maximal oversampling, the new MsFEM with constrained oversampling coincides with the ideal version (without localization) of the variational multiscale method presented in [MP11]. The localized versions are different but allow similar error estimates.

Proof of Theorem 4.12. Let u_H be the solution of (23) with the ideal corrector $Q_h = Q_h^\Omega$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|A^{1/2}(\nabla u_h - \nabla(u_H^k + Q_h^k(u_H^k)))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&\leq \|A^{1/2}(\nabla u_h - \nabla(u_H + Q_h^k(u_H)))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&\leq \|A^{1/2}(\nabla u_h - \nabla(u_H + Q_h^\Omega(u_H)))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&\qquad + \|A^{1/2}(\nabla(u_H + Q_h^\Omega(u_H)) - \nabla(u_H + Q_h^k(u_H)))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&\lesssim \gamma_{\min}^{-1/2}\|Hf\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|A^{1/2}\nabla((Q_h^\Omega - Q_h^k)(u_H))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 4.11, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|A^{1/2}\nabla((Q_h^\Omega - Q_h^k)(u_H))\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \left\| \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i} u_H(x_T) A^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(w_T^i - w_T^{i,k}) \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\overset{(*)}{\lesssim} k^d \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{i=1}^d |\partial_{x_i} u_H(x_T)|^2 \left\| A^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla(w_T^i - w_T^{i,k}) \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim k^d e^{-2r\cdot k} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{i=1}^d |\partial_{x_i} u_H(x_T)|^2 \|A^{1/2} e_i\|^2_{L^2(T)} \\
&\lesssim k^d e^{-2r\cdot k} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{i=1}^d \|A^{1/2}\nabla u_H\|^2_{L^2(T)} \\
&\lesssim k^d e^{-2r\cdot k} \|f\|^2_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we have used that $u_H = I_H(u_H + Q_h^\Omega(u_H))$, the stability of I_H and the energy estimate $\|A^{1/2}\nabla(u_H + Q_h^\Omega(u_H)\|_{L^2(T)} \lesssim \gamma_{\min}^{-1/2}\|f\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}$. The step $(*)$ would be obvious with k^d replaced by the number of coarse elements. The presence of this H-dependent constant would not be crucial because it is easily compensated by the exponentially decaying factor. The refined estimate with multiplicative constant k^d (which reflects the overlap of the patches) is possible because $a(w_T^i - w_T^{i,k}, w_K^j - w_K^{j,k})$ is essentially zero for T and K at a certain distance. We omit the technical details and refer to [MP11, Lemma 16] which carries over to the present setting using Lemma 4.10. ☐

Theorem 4.14 (L^2-estimates)**.** *Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $U(T) = U_k(T)$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{T}_H$ in Oversampling Strategy 3. Then the multiscale approximation u_H^k that solves* (23) *satisfies the error estimate*

$$\|u_h - (u_H^k + Q_h^k(u_H^k))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim (\gamma_{\min}^{-1}\|H\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + k^{d/2}e^{-rk})^2\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u_h - u_H^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad\lesssim \min_{v_H\in V_H} \|u_h - v_H\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + (\gamma_{\min}^{-1}\|H\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + k^{d/2}e^{-rk})^2\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

where u_h is the reference solution from (3) *and r is a positive constant.*

Proof. A standard Aubin-Nitsche duality argument yields the first estimate. The second estimate follows from the first one and the quasi-optimality and stability of the interpolation I_H in $L^2(\Omega)$. ☐

Remark 4.15 (Smooth coefficient with known smallest scale ε.)**.** Let Ω be convex, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ with $\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim 1$, $A \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ with $\|\nabla A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}$ with some small scale parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose uniform meshes $\mathcal{T}_H$ and $\mathcal{T}_h$ with $H \gtrsim \varepsilon \gtrsim h$. Under these assumptions, the error of the reference solution $u_h \in V_h$ is bounded as follows,

$$\|\nabla(u - u_h)\| \lesssim h\varepsilon^{-1}.$$

We refer to see [PS12] for details. If $k \gtrsim \log(H^{-1})$, Theorem 4.12 and Theorem 4.14 yield the error bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(u - u_H^k - Q_h^k(u_H^k))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim H + \tfrac{h}{\varepsilon}, \\ \|u - u_H^k - Q_h^k(u_H^k)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim H^2 + \left(\tfrac{h}{\varepsilon}\right)^2, \\ \|u - u_H^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim H + \left(\tfrac{h}{\varepsilon}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

5 Conclusion

In this work, we proposed a new oversampling strategy for the Multiscale Finite Element Method (MsFEM) which generalizes the original method without oversampling. The new strategy is based on an additional constrained for the solution spaces of the local problems. The error analysis suggests to choose oversampling layers of thickness $H\log(H^{-1})$ suffice to preserve the common convergence rates with respect to H. Moreover, this choice prevents resonance errors even for general L^∞ coefficients without any assumptions on the geometry of the microstructure or the regularity of A. In this respect, the method is reliable. The method is also highly efficient (as efficient as MsFEMs with classical oversampling) in the sense that structural knowledge about the coefficient, e.g. (local) periodicity or scale separation, may be exploited to reduce the number of corrector problems considerably or to reduce oversampling to very small layers.

References

[Abd09] A. Abdulle. The finite element heterogeneous multiscale method: a computational strategy for multiscale PDEs. In *Multiple scales problems in biomathematics, mechanics, physics and numerics*, volume 31 of *GAKUTO Internat. Ser. Math. Sci. Appl.*, pages 133–181. Gakkōtosho, Tokyo, 2009.

[BFHR97] F. Brezzi, L.P. Franca, T.J.R. Hughes, and A. Russo. $b = \int g$. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 145:329–339, 1997.

[Car99] Carsten Carstensen. Quasi-interpolation and a posteriori error analysis in finite element methods. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 33(6):1187–1202, 1999.

[CGH10] C.-C. Chu, I. G. Graham, and T.-Y. Hou. A new multiscale finite element method for high-contrast elliptic interface problems. *Math. Comp.*, 79(272):1915–1955, 2010.

[CH03] Zhiming Chen and Thomas Y. Hou. A mixed multiscale finite element method for elliptic problems with oscillating coefficients. *Math. Comp.*, 72(242):541–576, 2003.

[CS08] Zhangxin Chen and Tatyana Y. Savchuk. Analysis of the multiscale finite element method for nonlinear and random homogenization problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(1):260–279, 2007/08.

[DYX09] Weibing Deng, Xulai Yun, and Chunhong Xie. Convergence analysis of the multiscale method for a class of convection-diffusion equations with highly oscillating coefficients. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 59(7):1549–1567, 2009.

[EE03a] Weinan E and Bjorn Engquist. The heterogeneous multiscale methods. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 1(1):87–132, 2003.

[EE03b] Weinan E and Bjorn Engquist. Multiscale modeling and computation. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 50(9):1062–1070, 2003.

[EE05] Weinan E and Björn Engquist. The heterogeneous multi-scale method for homogenization problems. In *Multiscale methods in science and engineering*, volume 44 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng.*, pages 89–110. Springer, Berlin, 2005.

[EH07] Y. Efendiev and T. Hou. Multiscale finite element methods for porous media flows and their applications. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 57(5-7):577–596, 2007.

[EH09] Yalchin Efendiev and Thomas Y. Hou. *Multiscale finite element methods*, volume 4 of *Surveys and Tutorials in the Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, 2009. Theory and applications.

[EHG04] Y. Efendiev, T. Hou, and V. Ginting. Multiscale finite element methods for nonlinear problems and their applications. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 2(4):553–589, 2004.

[EHW00] Yalchin R. Efendiev, Thomas Y. Hou, and Xiao-Hui Wu. Convergence of a nonconforming multiscale finite element method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 37(3):888–910, 2000.

[EP03] Yalchin Efendiev and Alexander Pankov. Numerical homogenization of monotone elliptic operators. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 2(1):62–79, 2003.

[Glo06] Antoine Gloria. An analytical framework for the numerical homogenization of monotone elliptic operators and quasiconvex energies. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 5(3):996–1043 (electronic), 2006.

[Glo08] Antoine Gloria. An analytical framework for numerical homogenization. II. Windowing and oversampling. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 7(1):274–293, 2008.

[Hen12] Patrick Henning. Convergence of MsFEM approximations for elliptic, non-periodic homogenization problems. *Netw. Heterog. Media*, 7(3):503–524, 2012.

[HFMQ98] Thomas J. R. Hughes, Gonzalo R. Feijóo, Luca Mazzei, and Jean-Baptiste Quincy. The variational multiscale method - a paradigm for computational mechanics. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 166(1-2):3–24, 1998.

[HO09] Patrick Henning and Mario Ohlberger. The heterogeneous multiscale finite element method for elliptic homogenization problems in perforated domains. *Numer. Math.*, 113(4):601–629, 2009.

[HO11] Patrick Henning and Mario Ohlberger. A-posteriori error estimation for a heterogeneous multiscale method for monotone operators and beyond a periodic setting. *Preprint 01/11 - N, University of Münster*, 2011.

[HO12] Patrick Henning and Mario Ohlberger. A newton-scheme framework for multiscale methods for nonlinear elliptic homogenization problems. In *Proceedings of the Algoritmy 2012, 19th Conference on Scientific Computing, Vysoke Tatry, Podbanske, September 9-14, 2012*, pages 65–74, 2012.

[HOS12] Patrick Henning, Mario Ohlberger, and Ben Schweizer. Homogenization of the degenerate two-phase flow equations. *Preprint 02/12 - N, University of Münster*, 2012.

[Hug95] Thomas J. R. Hughes. Multiscale phenomena: Green's functions, the Dirichlet-to-Neumann formulation, subgrid scale models, bubbles and the origins of stabilized methods. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 127(1-4):387–401, 1995.

[HW97] Thomas Y. Hou and Xiao-Hui Wu. A multiscale finite element method for elliptic problems in composite materials and porous media. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 134(1):169–189, 1997.

[HWC99] Thomas Y. Hou, Xiao-Hui Wu, and Zhiqiang Cai. Convergence of a multiscale finite element method for elliptic problems with rapidly oscillating coefficients. *Math. Comp.*, 68(227):913–943, 1999.

[HWZ04] Thomas Y. Hou, Xiao-Hui Wu, and Yu Zhang. Removing the cell resonance error in the multiscale finite element method via a Petrov-Galerkin formulation. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 2(2):185–205, 2004.

[JKO94] V. V. Jikov, S. M. Kozlov, and O. A. Oleĭnik. *Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. Translated from the Russian by G. A. Yosifian.

[LM07] Mats G. Larson and Axel Målqvist. Adaptive variational multiscale methods based on a posteriori error estimation: energy norm estimates for elliptic problems. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 196(21-24):2313–2324, 2007.

[Mål11] Axel Målqvist. Multiscale methods for elliptic problems. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 9(3):1064–1086, 2011.

[MP11] A. Målqvist and D. Peterseim. Localization of Elliptic Multiscale Problems. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2011.

[PS12] D. Peterseim and S. Sauter. Finite elements for elliptic problems with highly varying, nonperiodic diffusion matrix. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 10(3):665–695, 2012.

[Yse86] Harry Yserentant. On the multilevel splitting of finite element spaces. *Numer. Math.*, 49(4):379–412, 1986.